

Art Unit: 2822

6. Claims 1, 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Babcock et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0080394 No. 5,734,183).

In regards to claim 1, Babcock et al. ("Babcock") discloses the following:

a) an emitter region including silicon and germanium (For Example: See Paragraph 34).

In regards to claim 3, Babcock discloses the following:

a) the silicon is polysilicon (For Example: See Paragraph 34).

In regards to claim 5, Babcock discloses the following:

a) the emitter region also includes carbon (For Example: See Paragraph 34).

7. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Harame et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,997,776).

In regards to claim 6, Harame et al. ("Harame") discloses the following:

a) a single layer of silicon that forms an emitter region (96) of the PNP transistor (For Example: See Figure 8); and

b) an extrinsic base region (92) of the NPN transistor and an intrinsic base region (54) of the NPN transistor (For Example: See Figures 7 and 8).

---

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

---

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.